| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | 10/716,506 | WHITTLE ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Christopher R. Tate | 1655 |
| All Participants: | Status of Application |): |
| (1) Christopher R. Tate. | (3) | |
| (2) <u>Richard Fichter</u> . | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: 1 May 2007 | Time: <u>11:00 AM</u> | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ No | oplicant's representative) | |
| If Yes, provide a brief description: | | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: All, iin general | | |
| Claims discussed: All, in general | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: All, in general | | : |
| Part II. | | · |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE G | ENERAL NATURE OF WHAT | WAS DISCUSSED: |
| Part III. | | |
| It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separ directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separ did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sun | The examiner will provide a rate record of the substance of | written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview |
| | | |
| | | |
| • | | • |
| | | |
| | | |
| (A) | | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Appl | licant/Applicant's Representat | ive Signature – if appropriate) |

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-413B)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Called Applicant's representative to discuss Examiner-proposed amendments to the claims to bring them in condition for allowance (including using the same/similar claim language to that of the previously allowed parent Applications). Applicants reprentative planned to discuss the proposed claim amendments with clients. Applicant's representative left a voice-message on 11 May 2007 stating that the clients were still discussing the proposed claim amendments and that no decision had yet been made by them.